



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/630,109	08/01/2000	Aaron K. Alexander	31042-13	6028

7590

10/23/2002

Troy J Cole Esq  
Woodard Emhardt Naughton Moriarty & McNett  
Bank One Center Tower  
111 Monument Circle Suite 3700  
Indianapolis, IN 46204-5137

EXAMINER

COPIER, FLORIS C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3643

DATE MAILED: 10/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/630,109

Applicant(s)

ALEXANDER ET AL.

Examiner

Chad Copier

Art Unit

3643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM  
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8 and 15-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8 and 15-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

PETER M. POON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 9.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: .

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the equilateral triangle configuration must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered. The examiner notes that Figures 2a and 2b show an isosceles, not equilateral triangle. No other drawings represent the claimed material.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 4-8, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Perry et al. '711 (disclosed by applicant).

As to claim 4, Perry discloses a pneumatic gun for shooting a paintball, comprising: a gun body having a first (12), second (60) and third (housing 25) bores, said first second and third bores having respective first, second and third longitudinal axes, the first, second and third longitudinal axes being parallel to one another and spaced apart from one another, said first bore having a chamber (Fig 1); a bolt (14) being slidable within said first bore (Fig 1); a rod (56) for actuating said bolt, said rod being slidable with the second bore (Fig 1).

As to claim 5, Perry discloses a pneumatic paintball gun, comprising: a source of compressed air (inherent); a gun body having a bore (60) with an external opening (col 4 lines 35-39 Fig 1); a pneumatic assembly (30, 32, 66) in fluid communication with the source, the pneumatic assembly having a first member (58) slidably coupled to a second member (54), the pneumatic assembly being located within the bore; and a third member (62, endcap near 58) coupled to the bore and covering the opening (col 4 lines 35-39), the third member being externally accessible and repeatedly removable; wherein removal of the third member permits the pneumatic assembly to be removed from the bore, and the first member is retained by the second member after removal from the bore (Fig 2).

As to claim 6, the assembly is a ram (col 5 lines 45-65).

As to claim 7, the third member has a screw end and is threaded to couple the portions to the bore (col 4 lines 35-39).

As to claim 8, the pneumatic assembly is a cartridge valve because it is encased (Fig 2).

As to claim 19, Perry discloses a pin (15) that couples the bolt and rod and is slidably removable to uncouple the rod and bolt (Fig 1).

As to claim 21, Perry discloses a paintball gun (title) that inherently receives paintballs.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 15, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gardner, Jr. (US 5967133).

As to claim 1, Gardner discloses a pneumatic paintball gun, comprising: a gun body (40) having first (3), second (2) and third (1) bores formed at least partially therethrough (Fig 2); wherein the first, second and third bores have respective first, second and third longitudinal axes (Fig 3); wherein the first, second and third longitudinal axes are parallel to one another (Fig 3); and wherein lines drawn connecting the first, second and third axes in a plane perpendicularly intersecting the first, second and third axes form a triangle (Fig 2).

The only difference between the claimed invention and Gardner is an exact equilateral triangle. This does not create a patentable distinction, however, because the

Art Unit: 3643

exact spacing and alignment of the three bores is a matter of design choice where the specific alignment and spacing is not disclosed by applicant to be particularly critical to the invention. It is noted that the drawings supplied by applicant have been objected to because even they fail to even show the equilateral triangle configuration. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the bores of Gardner in an equilateral triangle configuration as a matter of design choice among many alternative equivalent configurations.

As to claim 3, the first bore (3) expels the paintball and is above the other two bores (Fig 2).

As to claim 15, the first bore includes a bolt (26), the second bore includes a slidable hammer (6a, 21) for releasing air into the first bore, and a rod (5) in the third bore functioning to allow air into the mechanism thus allowing the bolt to be actuated.

As to claim 16, Gardner discloses this feature as discussed for claim 4 above.

As to claim 18, Gardner discloses a pressure regulator as discussed above.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gardner in view of Perry. Gardner discloses all of the features of the invention except a slidable pin for coupling the rod and bolt. Perry discloses a pin coupling a rod and bolt in separate chambers as discussed above. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the Pin, rod and bolt as per Perry with the gun body of Gardner because it would allow ease of removal of the various parts for cleaning.

Art Unit: 3643

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parry in view of Gardner.

Parry discloses all of the features of the invention except for the specific alignment of the three bores. This does not, however create a patentable distinction because whether or not the bores are aligned or in a triangle does not affect the functionality of the device and is merely a matter of design choice. One such design is shown by Gardner as discussed above. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to align the three bores of Parry in any number of different configurations depending on design choice for size, shape, compactness, balance or appearance including in the configuration of Gardner.

Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perry in view of Lotuaco, III '736 (disclosed by applicant).

Perry et al. discloses all of the features of the invention except two separate pressure regulators for differing pressures (col 1 lines 32-39). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include two separate pressure regulators in the paintball gun of Gardner to allow differing pressures to be used for the different mechanisms of the gun.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 7/31/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding applicant's arguments concerning the equilateral triangle, the examiner has discussed this limitation in the preceding rejection.

Art Unit: 3643

As to applicant's arguments regarding claim 5, the examiner has modified the rejection in response to the argument that the first and second elements be removed in together. However, the examiner maintains that the removal of the screw allows the removal of the elements from the bore whether from one end or the other.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chad Copier whose telephone number is 703-306-0939. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Poon can be reached on 703-308-2574. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687 for regular communications and 703-306-4195 for After Final communications.



Art Unit: 3643

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

fcc  
October 19, 2002



PETER M. POON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600